DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 824 SP 007 795

AUTHOR	Fischer, Stephen J.; Goddu, Roland J. B.
TITLE	Student Teaching Centers: A Pilot Project. Report Number 3.
INSTITUTION	Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. Center for Research and Development in Educational Differences.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Cooperative Research Program.
PUB DATE	67
CONTRACT	OEC-5-10-239
NOTE	29p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Office, Longfellow Hall, Appian Way, Cambridge, MA 02138
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85
DESCRIPTORS	College Supervisors; *Preservice Education; Student Teachers; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Interns

ABSTRACT

Student Teaching Centers (STC) were established as a pilot project by Harvard University in cooperation with several public schools. The centers are directed by resident supervisors who are responsible for the supervision of student teachers, demonstration teaching of a limited number of classes in their respective fields, and, in some cases, the development of new curricula and evaluative instruments for improving teaching and supervision in their budget areas. Student teachers in the program complete one year of education-related academic study at Harvard and a one-year teaching internship. An evaluation of the centers was made by surveying the student teachers by questionnaire and by interviewing the supervisors. A comparison of the responses of students in STCs and students in ordinary student teaching situations points up striking quantitative differences in the number of contacts with their supervisors and significant qualitative differences in the ratings of supervisors. Resident supervisors agreed that the STC concept greatly facilitated induction of teachers into the classroom and into the school as institution with particular regulations and mores. Even though the results are not the product of stringent and sophisticated procedures, the evaluation suggests continuation and expansion of student teaching centers. (HMD)

ED 088824

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Report Number 3

STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS: A PILOT PROJECT

Stephen J. Fischer
Roland J. B. Goddu

Center for Research and Development on
Educational Differences

Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

1967

The research and development reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract (OE 5-10-239) with the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Program.

Additional copies may be obtained from the Publications Office, Longfellow Hall, Appian Way, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

SP 007 795

INTRODUCTION

It is generally agreed among writers on teacher education and directors of teacher training programs that student teaching is a critical aspect of the preparation of teachers. It is also generally agreed that student teaching programs do not adequately incorporate essential ingredients for excellent student teaching: qualified instruction, proper scheduling, sufficient time, and supervisors who are experts in the teaching process and curriculum. Students can only learn about teaching if they are guided by sensitive and knowledgeable supervisors who have the time and resources necessary to capitalize upon their capabilities. Student teachers can only benefit from these supervisors if they have a sensible and appropriate schedule in the school and at the university.

A serious shortage of high quality supervisors currently exists across the country. The number of student teachers continues to rise while the already small number of qualified supervisors is spread thinner and thinner. A critical problem facing student teaching today is, therefore, the shortage of qualified supervisors. This situation has been exacerbated by the unwillingness or inability of many teacher training institutions to budget sufficient resources for supervision.

Characteristically, university supervisors are given an impossible number of student teachers without special salary inducements for taking on supervisory assignments. The situation for local school supervisors is perhaps more impossible. These teachers, usually already scheduled with a full teaching load, are given the supposed responsibility for supervision. Teacher training institutions reduce the supervisory function to a kind of slave labor by offering teachers little or no compensation for this work. On occasion there is compensation in the form of a course voucher, gift, or a few hundred dollars, but these are not rewards that can be considered equal to the quality of supervision desired.

It is clear then, that teacher training institutions and participating schools must seek and train qualified supervisors, affording these supervisors the time, resources, and compensation to perform their vital role in the student teaching process. To this end Student Teaching Centers, to be described below, were established by Harvard and several public school systems. This report will summarize the establishment of the Centers and plans for their future. The results of the evaluation of the Student Teaching Center will also be reported.

OPERATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS

Student Teaching Centers were created in response to a concern on the part of the Harvard Graduate School of Education and the area public schools participating in teacher preparation programs that a serious deficiency existed in student teaching programs. Specifically, the concerned institutions felt that student teachers were not receiving proper guidance in the problems of curriculum development and teaching. Furthermore, it was felt that more time should be devoted to the instruction of student teachers while they were actually resident in the schools and that student teacher and supervisor schedules should be so adjusted as to allow for such instruction to be of a high order.

During the academic year 1965-66, Student Teaching Centers were in operation for the first time, affecting approximately one-third (73) of the Graduate School's secondary student teachers. Centers were established in the Newton, Brookline, and Arlington public schools in the fields of mathematics, social sciences, French, and English. These Centers allowed an administrative arrangement within the schools, whereby supervision was given highest priority and through which the schools demonstrated their commitment to rendering special attention to student teaching.

Specifically, each Center was directed by a Resident Supervisor who was appointed jointly by the schools and the Graduate School of Education. The Resident Supervisors were members of both University and public school faculties. These Resident Supervisors were selected from Harvard Faculty members and advanced doctoral students, and from public school faculties. All had worked with student teachers in several of the Graduate School's teacher preparation programs, demonstrating their effectiveness as supervisors; and all of them indicated an interest in making supervision an important part of their careers in education. As a group, they represented an investment of $27,750 for supervisory services.

These Resident Supervisors were all responsible for the supervision of student teachers, the demonstration teaching of a limited number of classes in their respective fields, and, in several cases, for the development of new curricula and evaluative instruments for improving teaching and supervision in their subject areas. It is important to note that the Resident Supervisors were usually involved in curriculum projects as part of their supervisory role. Supervision in Student Teaching Centers is not construed to mean only the analysis of teaching, but also the teaching of curriculum.

Typically, the Resident Supervisor taught one or two classes a day, often demonstrating teaching techniques or a curriculum he had been developing. For example, the work of the Resident Supervisor in mathematics was largely devoted to the demonstration teaching of, and training in, an adaptation of the Illinois mathematics program for slow learners. In addition, she established a mathematics laboratory where students and teachers could work on problems and concepts through the use of concrete materials and mathematics games. One of the Resident Supervisors in English developed and taught (both pupils and teachers) a junior high school mythology-folklore curriculum which demonstrated that the themes, forms, or motifs found in myths and legends could serve as a frame of reference for the study of all Western literature as well as art and music. In demonstrating this curriculum, he effected reorganization of the school schedule and changes in staff utilization, making these subservient to rather than predominate over the curriculum. For example, the roles of lecturer, teacher, and teacher aide were shared by members of the English staff, affording a flexible team organization that allowed faculty members to give concerted attention to their particular strengths and interests in handling various aspects of the mythology-folklore unit.

The remainder of the Resident Supervisor's time was devoted to the supervision of student and first-year teachers. Some of these student teachers were supervised directly by the Resident Supervisor, and some were placed with competent members of the particular school staff. These school staff members were responsible to the Resident Supervisor for the supervision of particular student teachers and met individually with the Resident Supervisor to discuss problems occurring in the preparation of student teachers. The Resident Supervisors visited classes of and held conferences with all student teachers. In addition, the Resident Supervisor held supervision staff conferences with members of the faculty to discuss individual or common supervisory problems.

Resident Supervisors were given a great deal of autonomy by school principals, department heads, and the director of the Student Teaching Center Project at Harvard. As previously noted, the Resident Supervisors' capabilities had been demonstrated prior to their appointment; there was no need for a rigid inspection by members of the school and University administration. The Resident Supervisor was accorded the respect due a responsible professional, and similarly rewarded. Thus, the project director devoted most of his time to ironing out administrative arrangements between school and University as well as conducting periodic meetings as a forum for the Resident Supervisors to air different ideas and perceptions regarding supervisory problems.

Important features of the Student Teaching Center arrangement and the school-university appointments of Resident Supervisors were: identification and recognition by schools and the university of persons who are competent to supervise--i.e. teach about curriculum in a particular field; the availability of quality supervision in the location, the school, where situations demanding immediate and first-rate supervision do arise; the fact that the Resident Supervisor by virtue of teaching and supervising in the schools is thoroughly familiar with the particular student teaching locale involved--its curriculum and distinctive organizational features.

THE FUTURE OF STUDENT TEACHING CENTERS AT HARVARD

The further development and expansion of Student Teaching Centers will be critical to student teaching at the Harvard Graduate School of Education because of the Graduate School's recently expanded student teaching program. Where student teaching was formerly done either in a one semester full-time internship or a part-time apprenticeship of 12 to 14 weeks duration, the student teacher will now have one complete year of full-time internship in the schools and one complete academic year at Harvard. Dissatisfaction with the apprenticeship and one semester internship was primarily due to the fact that these arrangements created pressures of time and lack of support for the student teacher, inhibiting the realization of his teaching potential. The one-year internship is, in effect, the student teacher's first full-time year of experience. Student Teaching Centers established in all intern student teaching locales will thus provide a controlled and supportive atmosphere for the students' initial entry into the teaching profession.

Given the creation of one-year internships for all student teachers and given the above noted critical role that supervision provided by Student Teaching Centers must play in making the internship a positive entry into teaching, it is clear that Centers must be established to serve more than the one-third of the School's trainees prepared in the Centers during 1965-66. Furthermore, the willingness of public schools to commit themselves as training locales for inexperienced teachers for an entire year is predicated upon assurance of supervision of the highest quality. It is believed that such supervision can be made available by Resident Supervisors operating in the organizational framework provided by Student Teaching Centers.

Further assurance of first rate supervision will be made possible by Centers and Resident Supervisors by virtue of the supervisory training such an organization makes possible. Graduate students or teaching fellows who formerly had the major responsibility for the

supervision of student teachers will now be assigned to Resident Supervisors, enabling these graduate students to concentrate more effectively on their own training in curriculum and supervision. They will serve as apprentices to Resident Supervisors, with the Resident Supervisor placing graduate students in various supervisory situations and assessing their performance. Such a training arrangement and teaching function will strengthen the Resident Supervisor's university faculty status, provide structured field supervisory experience for graduate students, and will afford Resident Supervisors added and needed assistance in working with student teachers.

The existing Student Teaching Centers have been continued during 1966-67 and 1967-68, and may eventually be expanded in number beyond currently used locales and also beyond the geographic area immediately surrounding the University. The expanded location of Centers will allow interns to choose from a wide variety of geographical, cultural, and organizational school settings for their induction into the teaching profession. In addition to the currently established suburban settings, possibilities for Centers are currently being explored in urban locales, rural settings, and overseas areas. It is anticipated that school levels other than the present concentration in secondary schools will also be considered. A variety of possibilities will thus afford the student teacher ample opportunity to grapple with the varied problems of teaching and learning, to develop sensitivity to the issue of conceiving "appropriate" curriculum for a particular learning situation, and to develop a teaching style in which he has confidence. The careful supervision provided in the Student Teaching Center arrangement will insure that the student teacher gains the most from his first teaching experience.

The Student Teaching Center idea is, then, adaptable to many educational contexts. Centers need not be limited by labels (urban, suburban, public, private, university, college, elementary, secondary, etc.), but can be established wherever groups of student teachers gather under the tutelage of a man or woman of experience and demonstrated competence in educational practices and experiences relevant to the needs and interests of the students. Thus, a Center might be established in diverse locales, from the urban storefront tutoring center to the well appointed modern suburban high school. Centers can provide an organized response to the variety of educational problems emanating from a diversity of educational settings.

The next section will report on the evaluation of the Centers. The establishment of the Centers was initiated as a one-year pilot project with the understanding that if this project yielded positive results, it should appropriately be supported by the student teaching budget of the Graduate School of Education. Because of the conclusions reported below, the Graduate School administration has agreed to incorporate the cost of operating Student Teaching Centers into its regular budget.

FORMAL EVALUATION

The final evaluation of the Student Teaching Centers will be reported in two parts: a summary of student teacher responses to a questionnaire and a summary report of interviews with Resident Supervisors. An appendix contains a copy of the questionnaire and tables showing breakdowns of student teacher responses. These should be consulted when reading the summary statement of student teacher responses.

SUMMARY OF STUDENT TEACHER RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

To measure student teacher assessment of the supervision received during the student teaching phase of the Master of Arts in Teaching Program, a questionnaire (Appendix B) was distributed to all Fall and Spring student teachers (220). Useful questionnaires were returned by 116 (53%). Forty-five percent of the student teachers assigned to a Student Teaching Center[1] (STC) returned useful questionnaires. Fifty-two percent of those assigned to Ordinary Cooperating Teacher[2] arrangements (OCT) returned useful questionnaires. Upon inspection the sample was accepted as representative of the total student teaching population.

The questionnaire was designed with both structured and open-ended questions in an attempt to discriminate the quantitative and qualitative differences between the two arrangements. Of particular interest were qualitative differences reported in method of approaching discussion and development of curriculum materials. Actual differences reported do not reflect categorical judgments of good and bad. In general, however, the responses of student teachers begin to support the conclusion that the Student Teaching Centers do provide a climate for more consistent, high quality supervision than the Ordinary Cooperating Teacher arrangement. It should be noted that certain individual cooperating teachers in the ordinary arrangement do provide supervision judged very high quality by

---

[1] "Student Teaching Centers" describes an administrative arrangement whereby the school and university jointly pay the salary of an identified, experienced Master Teacher who is released within his school schedule for the supervision of student teachers, curriculum development, and/or in-service training of junior staff.

[2] "Ordinary Cooperating Teacher" arrangement describes the traditional and normal student teaching placement where a school staff person is assigned to supervise a student teacher with nominal payment and little or no administrative recognition of increased responsibility.

student teachers. But responses concerning Student Teaching Centers make it clear that, under the new arrangement, at least four or five student teachers are exposed to quality supervision at one time, whereas in the ordinary arrangement only one student teacher profits.

Quantitative differences between the two settings in amount of time devoted to supervisory activities are difficult to determine. TABLE I (Topics Covered While Discussing Student Teaching) shows that supervisors in both arrangements discuss the same general topics with reference to student teaching. Supervisors in the STC's are reported to discuss Methods of Presentation, Content, and Philosophy of Teaching more than the Ordinary Cooperating Teachers. TABLE II (Major Emphasis by Supervisor While Discussing Teaching) indicates that the major concerns in the STC's are Objectives, Methods of Presentation, Originality, Creativity, Innovation, Classroom Techniques. The major concerns of the OCT's are Methods of Control, Methods of Presentation, Planning, Mechanics. Philosophy of Teaching is not a major concern in either of the two supervisory settings. While Administrative Detail is discussed more often by the OCT's than in the STC's, in neither arrangement is this topic treated with great emphasis.

The only major divergence between the two arrangements are indicated by the OCT's consideration of Methods of Control and by the STC's attention to Originality, Creativity, Innovation. But treated as a whole, the data in TABLE II suggest that OCT's tend to be reported as focusing on more formal, organizational topics or structures; whereas the STC supervisors are reported as giving emphasis to teaching and learning concerns.

A similar concern for coming to grips with individual, personal decisions about teaching and learning comes out of the STC student teachers' responses to a general open-ended question about the effect of student teaching on their ideas about teaching, of themselves as teachers, and about teaching as a career. The STC student teachers give more detailed and specific comments about their teaching in regard to what they have gained, and what they know they still have to learn. The OCT student teachers report problems in quite general terms, implying in many cases that any solution was found intuitively and through personal initiative. The STC student teachers note that Resident Supervisors helped bolster student teacher/cooperating teacher relationships by spending more time in conference with the student teacher and cooperating with the other local supervisors when there was a problem. Also, comments about both cooperating teachers and Resident Supervisors in the STC situations were quite positive and, except in one case, do not suggest that the student teacher was threatened. Supervision in the STC's is reported to be worthwhile for the student teachers and to be more a part of the normal school situation. In contrast, many OCT student teachers

indicate a conflict as to the exact dimensions of the supervision and even the role to be taker by the supervisor. Thus, student teachers in the STC's seem to feel that the Resident Supervisors make them come to grips with many teaching and learning issues they must face as they begin their professional careers.

TABLES III (Total Number of Times Observed) and IV (Total Number of Times Teaching Discussed) show a real difference in the amount of time spent by supervisors of the STC's in the observation and/or discussion of teaching by and with individual student teachers. Even if the whole range of number of times is covered, the tables show a marked trend toward a greater investment of time in the STC's. A remarkable statistic is that 43% of the student teachers in the STC's report contact with their supervisors one or more times daily for observation. Thirty-five percent reported similar contact for discussion compared to 17% and 13% respectively for OCT's.

TABLE V (Rating of Supervision) shows that supervision is judged excellent to poor in both situations. Student teachers often accompanied a low rating (fair or poor) with the comment: "I think the more sympathetic a supervisor is, the more likely his advice is to be understood and heeded." The distributions on this table clearly indicate that there are excellent supervisors in both situations. But it does point out that the Student Teaching Centers have a higher proportion of supervisors rated very good-excellent. This difference between the STC and OCT arrangement is even more evident when one compares the rating of supervision with whether or not the supervisor is judged to help improve teaching (TABLE VI-9). TABLE VI (Summary of Response to Questionnaire Item 3: Did your supervisor help you improve your teaching?) shows clearly that proportionately more STC supervisors are judged to be more helpful. These tables also show that helpfulness and ratings of supervision are closely related dimensions.

TABLE VII (Amount of Autonomy) does not at first glance reveal striking differences. What is to be noted is the large number (19%) of student teachers who tied autonomy to a negative value in the OCT setting. This characteristic is even more striking when tied to comments such as: "My local supervisor was quite useless." ".... complete lack of structure..." "...so busy I seldom saw him." Another consideration is the high degree of autonomy felt by student teachers in the STC setting even with abundant and almost daily contact. The table points out therefore that autonomy was more positively valued in the STC setting.

In summary, the questionnaire analysis does point up striking quantitative differences in Number of Times Observed (TABLE III) and Number of Times Teaching Discussed (TABLE IV) and possibly in the

rating of helpfulness (TABLE VI). Even greater differences are hidden in qualitative additions to questionnaire responses and in the general comments section of the questionnaire. Analysis of these responses shows student teachers in the STC's as more careful and detailed in their analysis and commentary, as having a more positive reaction to continued and close supervision, and, except in one case, as having a definite feeling of growth promoted by supervisors. The Student Teaching Centers not only made it possible for judged high-quality supervisors to affect more than one student teacher, but the arrangement provided the student teacher with more school-located personnel for the observation, analysis, and evaluation of teaching and learning. The Student Teaching Center provided more time for supervision, a more professional analysis of teaching, a high degree of positively-valued autonomy for the student teacher, and a concern for the more fundamental issues in the teaching of children.

SUMMARY REPORT OF INTERVIEWS WITH RESIDENT SUPERVISORS

Interviews with the Resident Supervisors were open ended, lasting anywhere from 45 minutes to an hour and a half. Three broad questions were considered:

1. Have you operated differently this year by virtue of being a Resident Supervisor?

2. How is the creation of the Resident Supervisor role useful to teacher preparation?

3. How might the role be modified to improve teacher preparation?

These questions were not necessarily directly and systematically asked and answered but rather guided or cued the discussions in the minds of the interviewers. What follows, therefore, is a general summary of the responses to all questions.

The Resident Supervisors generally felt that the role gave them more authority to make suggestions regarding curriculum and to make various arrangements for improving the student teaching experience. For example, Resident Supervisors were often able to arrange more visits of student teachers to other classrooms and to influence the nature of the student teacher's class load and extra classroom duties. Some specific aspects of the Resident Supervisor's authority seemed to be a function of whether the Resident Supervisor was also a department chairman, an experienced member of the school faculty, or resident in the school but with formal obligations to Harvard (doctoral work, teaching obligations) that caused him to be perceived more as the "Harvard" man than as a regular full-time school faculty member.

If the Resident Supervisor was also a department chairman, it was generally felt that the former role supported the latter. This combination allowed the Resident Supervisor to be perceived as a man genuinely concerned with supervision and curriculum by virtue of the time he could devote to these areas. His dual role demonstrated this concern. If the Resident Supervisor was a school faculty member with no other particular status, he saw his role as one of potential conflict with the department chairman over the selection of cooperating teachers, assignment of student teachers, and effecting changes in curriculum. Such conflicts were not in fact reported for this year. One Resident Supervisor reported benefit deriving from the separation of Resident Supervisor and department chairman. Such a distinction allowed the former to think about and devote time to supervision without being encumbered by the administrative functions involved in the latter role. A supervisor who was resident in school by teaching there as well as supervising but who had heavy responsibilities at Harvard and who was perceived as such by school faculty, could be informative and convincing about Harvard's program and deal with criticisms of the program more effectively than the teaching fellow who occasionally visited the school. A reported problem in this combination, however, was in assuring the school that the efforts of the Resident Supervisor were not only for the benefit of Harvard but also of benefit to the school.

All the Resident Supervisors voiced interest in continuing in the role, stressing that it greatly facilitates induction of teachers into the classroom, into the curriculum, and into the school as an institution with particular regulations and mores. While all the Resident Supervisors reported that they were able to devote more time than usual to supervision and curriculum, several indicated that one of the most important contributions of the Resident Supervisor arrangement was in providing a structure for changing teaching arrangements to allow for more sequential supervision and better dissemination of new curriculum. For example, several suggestions were made regarding the teaming of Resident Supervisor, experienced teacher, first-year teacher, and student teacher, with such a team having responsibilities for the same block of classes. Some Resident Supervisors have taken steps in this direction by teaching classes jointly with student teachers or holding joint demonstration classes for student teachers and first-year teachers.

Most of the Resident Supervisors indicated that they wanted more involvement in the life of the University. Suggestions for further involvement included participation in seminars and methods courses, more special meetings at Harvard for Resident Supervisors, and the extension of some university courses to the school where some of the content of a course would be presented in the school by Resident Supervisors.

If there is one major conclusion to be drawn from these interviews, it is that the nature of the school or university involvement on the part of Resident Supervisors influences their perception of the role in a very essential way. The Resident Supervisor who has strong ties to the University tends to emphasize his function as one of bringing new ideas to the school and influencing change in curriculum. He sees supervision as helping the Student Teacher to develop in terms of becoming personally comfortable with developing valid curriculum. The Resident Supervisor whose fundamental allegiance is to the school sees supervision more as induction of student teachers into school life. Rather than emphasizing in-service work for experienced teachers on curriculum, he tends to stress the importance of training cooperating teachers in supervision and of developing criteria for the selection of cooperating teachers. Student teachers' conversations with this type of Resident Supervisor tend to deal with students and various aspects of teacher-pupil communication. Specific references to curriculum are not as pronounced.

The differences in perception follows quite logically from what the Resident Supervisors were doing prior to becoming "joint" appointments. As teachers they would be oriented toward the issues of working in the school setting. But as graduate students, problems of the school would be subordinate to the creation and justification of curriculum. It would seem necessary, however, that if the work of the Resident Supervisor is to be construed as supervision-curriculum and not one or the other, then the "jointness" of the appointment must be made more firm. To effect this possibility, the following steps are suggested: participation of Resident Supervisors in methods courses and tutorials as instructors; staffing an academic year supervision institute with Resident Supervisors as well as utilizing Resident Supervisors in the Harvard-Newton Summer Institute in Supervision; arrangement of school class schedules to allow Resident Supervisors to participate in faculty meetings, colloquia, and the various area meetings at the University.

CONCLUSION

These findings would seem to point to the efficacy of continuing the Student Teaching Centers and to expanding them where possible even though the evaluation results are not the product of stringent and sophisticated procedures. It is well known that such procedures and instruments are lacking in the area of teacher education. A somewhat more systematic supervisory structure such as that provided by the Student Teaching Centers will hopefully yield opportunities for the development of more rigorous procedures for evaluating student teaching and supervision. The results of this first year are not, then, considered as definitive.

The first year has, however, yielded "results" that make continuation of the present Centers a certainty, as noted above. Students were generally quite positive in commenting about supervision received in the Centers--often more so than those student teachers working with individual cooperating teachers. Resident Supervisors were in general agreement that creation of this new role afforded opportunity for better supervision and curriculum development. Also the comments of Resident Supervisors indicated that their new role--the authority and status it entailed--added an exciting dimension to their teaching careers.

It can be said with confidence that the Student Teaching Center arrangement compels the identification, utilization, and reward of high quality supervisors. Resident Supervisors do provide a desperately needed service to the University by insuring a healthy induction of students into teaching, and they can help the schools answer the ever increasing public demands for curriculum reform and better teaching.

APPENDIX A

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

The following are brief biographical sketches of the Resident Supervisors who participated in the Student Teaching Center Project during 1965-66. These sketches illustrate the diversity of educational backgrounds and professional experience which the Resident Supervisors brought to the Student Teaching Centers.

Mr. Stanley Bolster has been an associate professor on the Faculty of the Harvard Graduate School of Education since 1959. He came to Newton High School as an instructor in social studies in the fall of 1964. He received his undergraduate degree from Dartmouth College and his master's and doctorate from Harvard University. A former history teacher in Grosse Pointe, Michigan, and Pelham, New York, he has also studied at Michigan State University.

Mr. Henry Bissex has been an English instructor at Newton High School since 1946. He has served as Director of the Office of Student Teaching for both Newton high schools and as a coordinator of Harvard student teachers since 1962. A graduate of Hamilton College and the Harvard Graduate School of Education, he has also taught at Simmons College. From 1953 to 1954, he was Supervisor of Practice Teaching in English at Columbia Teachers College in New York City.

Miss Bonnie Allen returned to the English Department at Newton High School in 1964 after serving for two years as an English teacher at the Comprehensive High School in Abeokuta, Nigeria. A graduate of Bryn Mawr College and the Harvard Graduate School of Education, she joined the faculty at Newton High School in 1957. Prior to that time, she was Dean of Students at the Hockaday School in Dallas, Texas.

Mrs. Patricia Davidson is a graduate of Middlebury College and the Harvard Graduate School of Education, where she was a teaching fellow in 1964-65. She has taught mathematics at the Harvard-Boston Summer Program, Harvard-Newton Summer School, Wayland High School, Brookline High School, and the Arlington School in McLean Hospital, Belmont. She was the recipient of a National Science Foundation Grant for Experienced Teachers in 1962, 1963, and 1964.

Mr. John Katz, a member of the English Department at Newton's Weeks Junior High School, is a graduate of Miami University and holds an M.A. in English from Columbia University. He is currently studying for his doctorate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

He has taught English at Harvard-Newton Summer School and Watertown High School and was formerly a teaching fellow at Harvard.

Mr. Thayer Warshaw has been a member of the English Department at Newton High School since 1960 when he joined it as an intern teacher. A 1937 graduate of Harvard College, he returned to Harvard in 1960 after a successful business career to obtain a Master's degree in teaching. He became a full instructor of English at Newton in 1961 and has served as a master teacher in the Harvard-Newton Summer School.

Miss Mary Waters is assistant chairman of foreign languages at Newton High School where she has taught for twenty years. A graduate of Radcliffe College and the Harvard Graduate School of Education, she received a Fulbright Scholarship to study at the Sorbonne in France in 1952, a Ford Foundation grant for advance study in 1955, and a John Hay Fellowship to study at Harvard in 1964.

Mr. Gordon Neisser, a member of the Social Studies Department at Arlington, is a graduate of Swarthmore College and the Harvard Graduate School of Education, where he is currently studying for a doctorate. He has been a teaching fellow and research assistant at Harvard since 1962. Prior to that time, he taught at the Watchung Hills Regional High School in New Jersey and was a consultant to the Eagleton Institute at Rutgers University.

Mr. Saul Yanofsky is a member of the social studies department at Weeks Junior High School where he taught in 1963-64 before returning to Harvard to study for his doctorate. He has taught at North Reading High School and in the Harvard-Newton Summer Program. He received his undergraduate degree from Amherst College and his Master's degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Before coming to Brookline High School in 1965-66 as department chairman in history, Mr. John Robinson was a teacher in the Newton school system and served the previous year as assistant chairman of the History Department at Newton High School. He was graduated from Brown University and the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Mr. Norton Levy came to Brookline in 1965-66 as Mathematics Department chairman after ten years as acting chairman and supervisor of mathematics at Concord-Carlisle High School. A graduate of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, he received his undergraduate degree from the University of Chicago and has taught at Syracuse University.

Miss Helen Bridey, who has been teaching at Brookline since 1957, is chairman of the Modern Languages Department. She is a graduate of Emmanuel College and Middlebury College and has studied at the Sorbonne in Paris and at Columbia University.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

MAT's Reaction to Supervision during Student Teaching

NAME_____

Content Area_____

This questionnaire has two sections. Section One asks specifically about the supervision by the local supervisor. Section Two asks specifically about the supervision by the Harvard teaching fellow. You alone can really evaluate this supervision. Your candid answers will help us determine policies and practices for student teaching in the future. Please answer each question frankly and as extensively as necessary. Responses will be held in strictest confidence.

SECTION ONE: LOCAL SUPERVISOR

1. What did your local supervisor talk to you about while discussing your student teaching? (Please check as many as apply)

_____administrative details _____content

_____discipline _____planning

_____mechanics _____philosophy of teaching

_____method _____initiated by student teacher

_____(other)_____

_____

2. What did your local supervisor emphasize the most while discussing your teaching?

_____

3. Did your local supervisor help you improve your teaching? PLEASE EXPLAIN (e.g., presented alternative ways of teaching

a specific lesson, helped me select among different materials, etc.)

_____

_____

4. How much autonomy did you feel you had during your student teaching? (circle one)

   very much much some little very little none at all

   other_____

5. How often did your local supervisor observe you teach? (circle one)

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 (other)_____

6. How often did your local supervisor discuss your teaching with you?

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 (other)_____

7. How often did your local supervisor help you plan?

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 (other)_____

8. How many people did your local supervisor require you to observe and/or talk with about your teaching? _____

9. Rate the quality of the supervision given you by your local supervisor (circle one)

   excellent very good good average fair poor (other)_____

10. COMMENTS:

Please include your reaction to the effect of your student teaching on:

a) your ideas about teaching
b) you as a teacher
c) teaching as a career

--and anything else you feel was important.

SECTION TWO: HARVARD TEACHING FELLOW

1. How often did the teaching fellow observe you teach? (circle one)

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 (other)_____

2. How often did the teaching fellow discuss your teaching with you? (circle one)

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 (other)_____

3. Rate the quality of the supervision given you by the Harvard teaching fellow. (circle one)

   excellent very good good average fair poor (other)_____

4. What did the Harvard teaching fellow emphasize most while discussing your teaching? _____

5. COMMENTS

APPENDIX C

TABLES

TABLE I

TOPICS COVERED WHILE DISCUSSING STUDENT TEACHING

	Number of Times Category Used	
	Student Teaching Centers[1]	Ordinary Cooperating Teacher[2]
ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS	3 (04%)	21 (12%)
DISCIPLINE	10 (12%)	28 (16%)
MECHANICS	9 (11%)	28 (16%)
METHOD OF PRESENTATION	15 (18%)	16 (09%)
CONTENT	17 (20%)	22 (13%)
PLANNING AND PREPARATION	12 (14%)	17 (10%)
PHILOSOPHY OF TEACHING	9 (11%)	6 (03%)
EVERYTHING	6 (07%)	21 (12%)
PUPIL/TEACHER RELATIONS	-	2 (01%)
OBJECTIVES	-	1 (01%)
OTHER	4 (05%)	9 (05%)
BLANK	-	3 (02%)

[1] Includes supervision provided by Resident Supervisor and affiliated master teachers.

[2] Includes supervision provided by cooperating teachers and teaching fellows.

TABLE II

MAJOR EMPHASIS BY SUPERVISOR WHILE DISCUSSING TEACHING

	Student Teaching Centers		Ordinary Cooperating Teacher N = 81	Teaching Fellow N = 81
	Resident Supervisor N = 35	Cooperating Teacher N = 24		
BLANK	3	-	6	1
VARIETY OF EMPHASES	1	3	1	10
PHILOSOPHY OF TEACHING	-	-	-	1
METHODS OF CONTROL	-	1	16	7
MECHANICS	1	1	7	2
CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES	3	2	-	4
CONTROL AND CONTENT	-	1	1	-
METHODS AND CONTENT	1	1	2	1
CONTENT	1	2	4	2
METHOD OF PRESENTATION	7	3	14	20
PLANNING	2	2	8	6
OBJECTIVES	7	1	2	9
RAPPORT WITH & LEARNING BY CLASS	2	1	5	11
IMPROVING NATURAL APPROACH	-	2	1	-
ASSUMING ROLE OF TEACHER	-	1	1	-
PERSPECTIVE	1	-	-	1
ORIGINALITY, CREATIVITY, INNOVATION	5	1	-	2
POSITIVE REINFORCEMENT	-	-	2	1
HIS LOVE FOR TEACHING	-	-	-	1
NOTHING IN PARTICULAR	1	2	8	-
ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS	-	-	3	2

TABLE 11

TOTAL NUMBER OF TIMES OBSERVED

Number of Times	Student Teaching Centers[1] N = 35	Ordinary Cooperating Teachers[2] N = 81
0 - 5	3 (09%)	12 (15%)
6 - 10	5 (14%)	18 (22%)
11 - 15	3 (09%)	20 (25%)
16 - 20	1 (03%)	8 (10%)
21 - 25	3 (09%)	3 (04%)
26 - 35	5 (14%)	6 (07%)
Daily	2 (06%)	1 (01%)
Daily + 0 - 5	6 (17%)	11 (14%)
Daily + 6 - 10	6 (17%)	2 (02%)
Daily + over 10	1 (03%)	- -
TOTAL: one or more times daily	15 (43%)	14 (17%)

[1] Includes supervision provided by Resident Supervisor and affiliated master teachers.

[2] Includes supervision provided by cooperating teachers and teaching fellows.

TABLE IV

TOTAL NUMBER OF TIMES TEACHING DISCUSSED

Number of Times	Student Teaching Centers[1] N = 35	Ordinary Cooperating Teachers[2] N = 81
0 - 5	4 (11%)	7 (09%)
6 - 10	5 (14%)	20 (25%)
11 - 15	5 (14%)	24 (30%)
16 - 20	2 (06%)	10 (12%)
21 - 25	2 (06%)	3 (04%)
26 - 35	5 (14%)	6 (07%)
Daily	2 (06%)	1 (01%)
Daily + 0 - 5	6 (17%)	5 (06%)
Daily + 6 - 10	3 (09%)	4 (05%)
Daily + over 10	1 (03%)	1 (01%)
TOTAL: one or more times daily	12 (35%)	11 (13%)

[1]Includes supervision provided by Resident Supervisor and affiliated master teachers.

[2]Includes supervision provided by cooperating teachers and teaching fellows.

TABLE V

RATING OF SUPERVISION RECEIVED DURING STUDENT TEACHING

	Student Teaching Center		Ordinary Cooperating Teacher N = 81	Teaching Fellow N = 81
	Resident Supervisor N = 35	Cooperating Teacher N = 24		
EXCELLENT	13 (37%)	11 (46%)	16 (20%)	13 (16%)
VERY GOOD	9 (26%)	6 (25%)	21 (26%)	32 (40%)
GOOD	8 (23%)	4 (17%)	9 (11%)	10 (12%)
AVERAGE	1 (03%)	- -	11 (14%)	10 (12%)
FAIR	1 (03%)	3 (12%)	11 (14%)	8 (10%)
POOR	1 (03%)	1 (04%)	12 (15%)	4 (05%)
OTHER:				
Frustrating	1 (03%)			
Friendly	1 (03%)			
In-appropriate			1 (01%)	2 (02%)
No Answer				2 (02%)

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 3

"Did your supervisor help you improve your teaching?"

	Student Teaching Centers	Ordinary Cooperating Teacher
YES	24 (69%)	42 (52%)
NO	9 (26%)	35 (43%)
UNCERTAIN	2	4

TABLE VI-9

COMPARISON OF RATING OF SUPERVISION / HELP TO IMPROVE TEACHING

	YES		NO		UNCERTAIN	
	STC	OCT	STC	OCT	STC	OCT
EXCELLENT	16 (46%)	16 (20%)				
VERY GOOD	7 (20%)	16 (20%)	1 (03%)	4 (05%)		
GOOD		5 (06%)	3 (09%)	4 (05%)		
AVERAGE	1 (03%)	5 (06%)		6 (07%)		
FAIR			3 (09%)	10 (12%)		
POOR			2 (06%)	11 (14%)		
TOTAL NUMBER	24	42	9	35	2	4

	STC	OCT
NOTE: Per cent receiving Excellent rating	46%	20%
Excellent or Very Good	66%	40%

TABLE VII

AMOUNT OF AUTONOMY FELT DURING STUDENT TEACHING

	Student Teaching Centers	Ordinary Cooperating Teacher
VERY MUCH	23 (66%)	59 (73%)
MUCH	6 (17%)	11 (14%)
SOME	2 (06%)	9 (11%)
LITTLE	3 (09%)	
VERY LITTLE	1 (03%)	2 (02%)
"VERY MUCH" WITH NEGATIVE VALUE	1 (03%)	15 (19%)